



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/684,861	10/06/2000	Paul Bilbin	PSTM0024/MRK	2827
29524	7590	07/06/2005	EXAMINER	
KHORSANDI PATENT LAW GROUP, A.L.C. 140 S. LAKE., SUITE 312 PASADENA, CA 91101-4710			VAN DOREN, BETH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3623	

DATE MAILED: 07/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/684,861	BILIBIN ET AL.	
	Examiner Beth Van Doren	Art Unit 3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 April 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a non-final office action in response to communications received 04/13/2005. Claims 19-21 have been added. Claim 4 has been amended. Claims 1-21 are pending.

Affidavit

2. The Affidavit filed on 04/13/05 under 37 CFR 1.131 is sufficient to overcome the Barni et al. (U.S. 6,064,981) reference. However, after a further search, a new rejection has been set forth below.

Response to Amendment

3. Applicant's amendments to the specification are sufficient to overcome the objections set forth in the previous office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-9 and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thiel (U.S. 5,699,258).

5. As per claim 1, Thiel discloses a shipping management computer system, said computer system programmed to:

in response to each respective request by each particular user of a plurality of users to ship a particular respective parcel, wherein each respective request includes a first address and a

Art Unit: 3623

second address, determine a respective potential cross-comparison delivery schedule, said respective cross-comparison delivery schedule comprising a plurality of respective service-specific carrier-specific delivery schedules to ship the particular respective parcel from the first address to the second address, wherein each respective service-specific carrier-specific delivery schedule corresponds to a respective particular delivery service of a plurality of delivery services offered by a particular carrier of a plurality of carriers, wherein the shipping management computer system is accessed by each respective particular user via a communications network using a respective user client computer device (See abstract, column 4, line 60-column 5, line 15, column 8, line 45-66, column 11, lines 1-25 and 46-54, wherein a request of a user to ship a parcel from a first address to a second address is received and a comparison is generated concerning multiple carriers using carrier specific data and the services offered. See figure 1, column 2, lines 35-61, column 3, lines 9-26, column 7, lines 25-35, and column 10, lines 15-35, all of which discuss the architecture of the system including a communications network and a client device).

6. As per claim 2, Thiel teaches a shipping management computer system, said computer system further programmed to:

calculate a respective shipping rate for each said respective particular delivery service to ship the particular respective parcel according to the respective service-specific carrier-specific delivery schedule (See column 4, line 60-column 5, line 15, column 6, lines 49-55, column 8, line 45-66, column 10, line 65-column 11, line 25 and 46-54, wherein a shipping rate is calculated for each carrier).

Art Unit: 3623

7. As per claim 3, Thiel teaches the shipping management computer system further programmed to: in response to a user request by a respective particular user for a shipping rate and delivery schedule comparison, generate a display of an online, interactive prompt to a display monitor configured with the respective user client computer device of the respective particular user, said online interactive prompt comprising a simultaneous cross-comparison of said respective shipping rates, the display of each respective shipping rate corresponding to a display of the respective service-specific carrier-specific delivery schedule for the particular delivery service to ship the particular respective parcel (See column 6, lines 7-11 and 50-55, column 7, lines 15-30, column 10, lines 45-64, column 11, lines 45-55, wherein a display shows a cross comparison of multiple carriers by plans, charges, and types. See figure 1, column 2, lines 35-61, column 3, lines 9-26, column 7, lines 25-35, and column 10, lines 15-35, all of which discuss the architecture of the system including a communications network and a client device connected to the network).

8. Claims 4, 5, and 6 recite equivalent limitations to claims 1, 2, and 3, respectively, and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale as applied above.

9. Claims 7, 8, and 9 recite equivalent limitations to claims 1, 2, and 3, respectively, and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale as applied above.

10. As per claim 14, Thiel teaches wherein the respective potential cross-comparison delivery schedule comprises each respective particular delivery service of the plurality of delivery services offered by each respective particular carrier of the plurality of carriers at which to deliver the particular respective parcel, wherein the services are associated with dates (See

Art Unit: 3623

abstract, column 4, line 60-column 5, line 15, column 8, line 45-66, column 11, lines 1-25 and 46-54, which discloses a cross-comparison).

However, while Thiel discloses the date of shipping and planning delivery based on the shipment type, such as express mail, Thiel does not expressly disclose a respective delivery date and a respective delivery time for each service.

Thiel discloses a system that compares multiple carriers and the services the carriers offer. Thiel further discloses the date of the shipment and the shipment types for carriers, these shipment types including express mail, priority mail, etc. It is well known in the art of shipping that express delivery is guaranteed next day delivery, that priority mail is a guaranteed 2-day service, etc. Therefore, since Thiel discloses specifying a date of shipment in the system and types of services for multiple carriers that include guaranteed times to delivery, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include displaying the delivery date and time to increase the user friendliness of the system by making the display contain more complete information concerning the services of Thiel, thus allowing a user to come to a conclusion about a choice. See at least column 11, lines 45-55.

11. Claims 15 and 16 recite equivalent limitations to claims 2 and 3, respectively, and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale applied above.

12. As per claim 17, Thiel teaches wherein each respective service-specific carrier-specific delivery schedule corresponds to a schedule for a particular delivery service offered by a particular carrier to deliver the particular respective parcel (See abstract, column 4, line 60-column 5, line 15, column 8, line 45-66, column 11, lines 1-25 and 46-54, wherein the comparison shows multi-carrier schedule data with respect to the parcel).

Art Unit: 3623

13. As per claim 18, teaches wherein said respective cross-comparison delivery schedule comprises a respective service-specific carrier-specific delivery schedule for each particular delivery service of the plurality of delivery services offered by each carrier of the plurality of carriers, wherein each said particular delivery service would provide delivery of the particular respective parcel (See abstract, column 4, line 60-column 5, line 15, column 8, line 45-66, column 11, lines 1-25 and 46-54, wherein the comparison shows multi-carrier schedule data with respect to the parcel).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10-13 and 19-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thiel (U.S. 5,699,258).

15. As per claim 10, teaches a shipping management computer system for:
allowing a user to request a package delivery service by providing shipping specifications (See column 4, line 60-column 5, line 15, column 8, line 45-66, column 11, lines 1-25 and 46-54, wherein a request is allowed to the system);
receiving said shipping specifications from said user (See column 3, lines 35-42, column 8, line 45-66, column 11, lines 1-25 and 46-54, wherein the specifications of the origin and destination are received, as well as a weight and type of mail);

Art Unit: 3623

identifying, from a plurality of carriers, a subset of carriers based on said shipping specifications, each of said subset of carriers being capable of satisfying said shipping specifications by providing said package delivery service to said user (See abstract, column 4, line 60-column 5, line 15, column 8, line 45-66, column 11, lines 1-25 and 46-54, wherein a subset of carriers are identified based on the provided specifications);

identifying a first carrier from said subset of carriers and a first set of shipment types provided by said first carrier (See abstract, column 4, line 60-column 5, line 15, column 8, line 45-66, column 11, lines 1-25 and 46-54, wherein the different type of shipments are identified for the first carrier, such as express, air, priority mail or general delivery);

determining a first set of delivery schedules according to which said first carrier would be able to satisfy said shipping specifications, each one of said first set of delivery schedules corresponding to at least one of said first set of shipment types (See column 4, line 60-column 5, line 15, column 8, line 45-66, column 11, lines 1-25 and 46-54, which discloses the delivery schedules associated with the shipping specifications, such as next day delivery);

calculating a first set of service charges by said first carrier, each one of said first set of service charges calculated based upon at least one of said first set of shipment types provided by said first carrier (See column 4, line 60-column 5, line 15, column 6, lines 49-55, column 8, line 45-66, column 10, line 65-column 11, line 25 and 46-54, wherein charges are calculated);

displaying to the user said first set of delivery schedules, said first set of service charges, and said first set of shipment types (See column 6, lines 7-11 and 50-55, column 7, lines 15-30, column 10, lines 45-64, column 11, lines 45-55, wherein the user displays plans, charges, and types);

identifying a second carrier from said subset of carriers and a second set of shipment types provided by said second carrier (See abstract, column 4, line 60-column 5, line 15, column 8, line 45-66, column 11, lines 1-25 and 46-54, wherein the different type of shipments are identified for a second carrier, such as express, air, priority mail or general delivery);

determining a second set of delivery schedules that said second carrier is capable of providing to said user, each one of said second set of delivery schedules corresponding to at least one of said second set of shipment types (See column 4, line 60-column 5, line 15, column 8, line 45-66, column 11, lines 1-25 and 46-54, which discloses the delivery schedules associated with the shipping specifications, such as next day delivery);

calculating a second set of service charges by said second carrier, each one of said second set of service charges calculated based upon at least one of said second set of shipment types provided by said second carrier (See column 4, line 60-column 5, line 15, column 6, lines 49-55, column 8, line 45-66, column 10, line 65-column 11, line 25 and 46-54, wherein charges are calculated); and

displaying to the user said second set of delivery schedules, said second set of service charges, and said second set of shipment types (See column 6, lines 7-11 and 50-55, column 7, lines 15-30, column 10, lines 45-64, column 11, lines 45-55, wherein the user displays plans, charges, and types).

However, while Thiel discloses the date of shipping and planning delivery based on the shipment type, such as express mail, Thiel does not expressly disclose a delivery date and time.

Thiel discloses the date of the shipment and the shipment types for carriers, these shipment types including express mail, priority mail, etc. It is well known in the art of shipping

that express delivery is guaranteed next day delivery, that priority mail is a guaranteed 2-day service, etc. Therefore, since Thiel discloses specifying a date of shipment in the system and types of services that include guaranteed times to delivery, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include displaying the delivery date and time to increase the user friendliness of the system by making the display contain more complete information concerning the services of Thiel, thus allowing a user to come to a conclusion about a choice. See at least column 11, lines 45-55.

16. As per claim 11, Thiel teaches a shipping management computer system wherein said shipping specifications comprise a package weight, a package size, an origin, and a destination (See column 8, line 45-66, column 10, lines 45-55, column 11, lines 1-25 and 35-50, wherein the specifications include, weight, origin, size, and destination)
17. As per claim 12, Thiel discloses wherein said shipping specifications further comprise a shipping date (See column 6, lines 23-33, column 7, line 44-column 8, line 5, and column 9, lines 1-10wherein the date to be shipped is recorded for fee purposes).
18. As per claim 13, Thiel teaches wherein said first set of shipment types comprise ground shipment, next day air, and express shipment (See column 8, line 45-66, which discloses the shipment types).
19. As per claim 19, Thiel discloses wherein said first set of delivery schedules comprises:
 - a delivery schedule according to which said first carrier would be able to satisfy said shipping specifications via a first shipment type (See abstract, column 4, line 60-column 5, line 15, column 8, line 45-66, column 10, line 56-column 11, line 1-25 and 46-54, which is the first carrier that is able to satisfy the shipping request of a first type); and

Art Unit: 3623

a delivery schedule according to which said first carrier would be able to satisfy said shipping specifications via a second shipment type, said second shipment type being different from said first shipment type (See abstract, column 4, line 60-column 5, line 15, column 8, line 45-66, column 10, line 56-column 11, line 1-25 and 46-54, which is the first carrier that is able to satisfy the shipping request of a second type).

20. As per claim 20, Thiel teaches wherein said second set of delivery schedules comprises:

a delivery schedule according to which said second carrier would be able to satisfy said shipping specifications via said first shipment type (See column 4, line 60-column 5, line 15, column 8, line 45-66, column 10, line 56-column 11, line 1-25 and 46-54, which shows a second carrier able to satisfy the specifications for the first type).

21. As per claim 21, Thiel teaches wherein said second set of delivery schedules comprises:

a delivery schedule according to which said second carrier would be able to satisfy said shipping specifications via said second shipment type (See column 4, line 60-column 5, line 15, column 8, line 45-66, column 10, line 56-column 11, line 1-25 and 46-54, which shows a second carrier able to satisfy the specifications for the second type).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Barns-Slavin et al. (U.S. 5,995,950) discloses looking at the weight, the origin, and the destination for shipping rates.

U.S. Postal Service (www.usps.com) discloses rate calculators and fee structures for different shipment types.

"UPS Offers free shipping cost calculator software" (Newsbytes News Network) discloses rate comparisons for shipment types.

"Iship.com raises 3.4 million" (PR Newswire) discloses Internet Package Shipper and comparing services and rates offered by leading package carriers.

"Iship.com launches first complete web-based shipping service" (PR Newswire) discloses features of iship.com.

"Microsoft and iship.com make comparing shipping services Easy on MSN.com" (PR Newswire) discloses comparing shipping features, vendors, options, and prices to determine the best service for the individual.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beth Van Doren whose telephone number is (571) 272-6737. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

bvd

"UPS Offers free shipping cost calculator software" (Newsbytes News Network) discloses rate comparisons for shipment types.

"Iship.com raises 3.4 million" (PR Newswire) discloses Internet Package Shipper and comparing services and rates offered by leading package carriers.

"Iship.com launches first complete web-based shipping service" (PR Newswire) discloses features of iship.com.

"Microsoft and iship.com make comparing shipping services Easy on MSN.com" (PR Newswire) discloses comparing shipping features, vendors, options, and prices to determine the best service for the individual.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beth Van Doren whose telephone number is (571) 272-6737. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

bvd
bvd
June 29, 2005


TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600